



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,790	12/21/2000	Hirota Yamaji	NEC2090-US	6402

30743 7590 10/22/2004

WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

NOLAN, DANIEL A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

E

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

09/740,790

YANAJI

EXAMINER

Nolan

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2654


041017

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reference to Peifer et al missing from the action mailed 10/12/2004 are attached.


DANIEL NOLAN
PATENT EXAMINER

Attachments: PTO-892

12. Regarding claim 6, the claim is set forth with the same limits as claim 1.

While Ozawa et al discloses *headers* (§[0035]) holding administration data, neither they nor Milsted et al nor Haber et al nor Rao et al nor Dean et al nor Oshima specifically mention that such information would include *authorization*.

Van Wie et al (column 17 lines 18-19) read on the feature that the *authorization data writing section writes authorization data within a header information section of digital audio data* which would have made it obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of speech signal processing at the time of the invention to apply the method/teachings of Van Wie et al to the device/method of Ozawa et al or Milsted et al or Haber et al or Rao et al or Dean et al or Oshima to prevent non-acoustic authorization and other protocols from interfering with the payload signal content.

Ozawa et al, Milsted et al, Haber et al, Rao et al, Dean et al, Oshima & Peifer et al

13. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al in view of Milsted et al and further in view of Haber et al and further in view of Rao et al and further in view of Dean et al and further in view of Oshima and further in view of Peifer et al (U.S. Patent 5,87,19).

14. Regarding claim 8, the claim is set forth with the same limits as claim 1.

While Ozawa et al discloses *home network*, neither they nor Milsted et al nor Haber et al nor Rao et al nor Dean et al nor Oshima specifically mention selection from those